

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. In the current amendment, claims 1, 7, 17, 19, 20 and 29 have been amended. Support for the amended claims can be found in paragraphs [0005], [0017], [0018], [0024], [0025], [0026], [0027], [0030], [0035], [0038] and [0046], as well as in Fig. 1 and Fig. 3. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the current amendment, claims 1-43 will be pending in this application, of which claims 1, 17 and 29 are independent. Applicant submits that pending claims 1-43 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections and urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102I. Claims 17-21 and 25-28 Rejected over Eaton

Claims 17-21 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0101343 to Eaton et al (“Eaton”) under 35 U.S.C. §102. Claim 17 is an independent claim. Claims 18-21 and 25-28 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 17, as amended. Applicant traverses this rejection and submits that Eaton fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claim 17, as amended.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Amended independent claim 17 is directed towards a method for providing remote access to a plurality of application

sessions. Claim 17 recites receiving a user's selection indicating to connect to a first disconnected application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions provided via a menu option to the user during the operation of the first computer. Applicant submits that Eaton fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Eaton does not disclose receiving a user's selection indicating to connect to a first disconnected application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions provided via a menu option to the user during operation of the first computer. Rather, Eaton transfers client data from a first session of the user on a first messaging client to a second session of the user on a second messaging client. Eaton merely provides a data transfer signal to transfer data from the first messaging client to the second messaging client without providing a menu option to the user to select one or more messaging clients from a plurality of disconnected messaging clients from which to perform the data transfer. Thus, Eaton fails to disclose receiving a user's selection indicating to connect to a first application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions provided via a menu option to the user during operation of the first computer.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, Eaton fails to disclose each and every feature of amended independent claim 17. Thus, Applicant submits independent claim 17 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 18-21 and 25-28 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 17 as amended. Thus, Applicant submits that the claims 18-21 and 25-28 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 18-21 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103II. Claims 1-16, 22-24 and 29-43 rejected over Eaton and Knouse

Claims 1-16, 22-24 and 29-43 are rejected as unpatentable over Eaton and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0101343A1 to Knouse et al. (“Knouse”) under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 1 and 29 are independent claims. Claims 2-16 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 30-43 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 29, as amended. Applicant traverses this rejection and submits that Eaton and Knouse, alone or in combination, fail to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, as amended.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, there must be: a) some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, b) a reasonable expectation of success, and c) the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Neither Eaton, Knouse nor the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art provide a suggestion or motivation to modify Eaton with the teachings of Knouse. Eaton describes enabling a user of a text messaging application to continue a text messaging session of one device on a different device. Eaton states its purpose is to “allow the account user to continue the messaging session when the account user is no longer in proximity to the fixed network device.” (Eaton, paragraphs [0012] and [0013]). Further to this purpose, Eaton distributes authentication keys to enable re-authentication of the user while allowing the user to reconnect to the session as the user moves from the fixed network device to another device. (See Eaton, FIG. 2). Knouse, on the other hand, “uses contents of an existing encrypted cookie to

bypass authentication and proceed to authorization” when reconnecting to a session from the same device. (Knouse, Abstract). A cookie is stored in the client’s storage device for re-transmission from that client device to a server. The bypassing of authentication by the cookie of Knouse limits the user to reconnecting to the session from the client device storing the cookie. This is contrary to requiring re-authentication by Eaton using an authentication key as users reconnect to the session while moving between devices. Furthermore, the cookie mechanism of Knouse would not help Eaton in authorization of users roaming between devices in which the device does not support cookies. As the user in Eaton moves between devices not supporting cookies, Eaton would not be able to perform the cookie-based authorization as in Knouse. Therefore, there is no motivation or suggestion in either Eaton, Knouse or to those ordinary skilled in the art to modify Eaton with the teachings of Knouse.

Moreover, Eaton and Knouse, alone or in combination, fail to teach all the claim limitations of the claimed invention. Amended claims 1 and 29 are directed to a method and server, respectively, for providing remote access to a plurality of disconnected application sessions. These claims recite reestablishing the first disconnected application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions with a client computer operated by the user in response to the determined rule. Applicant submits that Eaton and Knouse, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Eaton fails to teach or suggest reestablishing the first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions with a client computer operated by the user in response to the determined rule. The examiner cites Knouse for this purpose. However, as with Eaton, Knouse also fails to teach or suggest reestablishing the first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected

application sessions with a client computer operated by the user in response to the determined rule. Instead, Knouse applies authorization rules for established application sessions. The authorization rules of Knouse are not applied to the re-establishment of a disconnected application session but to the access of resources via an established application session. In contrast, the claimed invention authenticates a user, determines a rule and responsive to the determined rule, re-establishes a disconnected application session of the user. Thus, Knouse and Eaton, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest reestablishing the first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions with a client computer operated by the user in response to the determined rule.

Because Eaton and Knouse, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention, Applicant submits independent claims 1 and 29 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-16 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1 as amended. Claims 30-43 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 29 as amended. Thus, Applicant submits dependent claims 2-16 and 30-43 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of independent claims 1-16 and 29-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

III. Dependent Claims 22-24 Patentably Distinguished Over Eaton and Knouse

Claims 22-24 are rejected as unpatentable over Eaton in further view of Knouse under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 22-24 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 17 as amended. As discussed above in connection with the rejection of

independent claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102, Applicant submits independent claim 17 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

As with Eaton, Knouse does not teach or suggest receiving a user's selection indicating to connect to a first disconnected application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions provided via a menu option to the user during operation of the first computer. Thus, Knouse does not detract from the patentability of independent claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant submits dependent claims 22-24 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicant contends that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: April 15, 2008

/Christopher J. McKenna/
Christopher J. McKenna, Esq.
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicant

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
2 International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000